

9 January 1973

MEMORANDUM FOR THE CIA MEMBER, USIB

SUBJECT : CCPC Study on Intelligence Activities Against  
Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs

REFERENCE: USIB-D-64.7/2 (CCPC-D-18/72) TS-204206/72  
and Special Appendix SC-09918/72

1. This is a supplemental briefing memorandum on subject CCPC study which is item #2 on the USIB agenda for 11 January 1973. This is the second USIB consideration of this study. Our briefing memorandum of 22 November 1972 gives the complete background on the study.

2. At the USIB meeting of 14 December, the USIB made two minor changes in the report, which were merely matters of updating, and a more substantive change in the introductory paragraph of the Major Problem Areas section of the paper.

3. The Board remanded the study to the CCPC at the request of Mr. William Sullivan, Director of the Office of National Narcotics Intelligence, to clarify the role of the ONNI in the narcotics field. The CCPC met on 19 December to consider ONNI's problem with respect to the paper. The Chairman, CCPC took the strong position that neither the CCPC nor the USIB is the appropriate mechanism in which to clarify ONNI's own mission and role with regard to those agencies with some responsibility for narcotics intelligence activities. Some specific revisions, however, were made at the behest of ONNI.

a. The first of these are on pages 27 and 28. The paraphrase of the Executive Order previously contained on page 28 was deleted and the Executive Order itself appended as Appendix 2 to the report. Additionally, a paragraph was included to the following effect: "2. On 6 December 1972, the Attorney General sent a memorandum to all

2  
E. J. IMPDET CL BY 201

~~SECRET~~

SECRET

- 2 -

Departments and Agencies to which he attached a statement of the role and mission of the Office of National Narcotics Intelligence as approved by the Attorney General." Although ONNI requested that the mission statement also be appended to the report, this request was denied on the basis of the fact that it would be inappropriate for the study and that it is still being commented on by various agencies of the government. This decision was accepted by the ONNI representatives and later by Mr. Sullivan.

b. ONNI's next problem concerned page 36, paragraphs 3 and 4. ONNI requested the deletion of the final sentence of paragraph 3. (This paragraph concerns the lack of a central repository or data base of narcotics intelligence information and of collation and analysis of such information and states that ONNI was brought into being to help solve this problem.) The final sentence read as follows: "However, the degree to which it [ONNI] may be able to do so, certainly within the near future, is unclear at this time in view of the magnitude of staffing and organizational problems confronting the new office." This sentence had been put in by the CCPC Working Group to protect ONNI, although ONNI had not so interpreted it. The sentence was deleted by the CCPC.

c. Paragraph 4 concerns the need for a central coordinating mechanism for narcotics intelligence problems. The last two sentences read as follows: "A great need for an objective body which could monitor the worldwide narcotics intelligence effort and ensure its adequate coordination at the Washington level is thus apparent. Such a body should be independent of parochial departmental and agency interests and be able to bring to bear on the problem all of the intelligence interests of the Government." ONNI felt that this coordination was ONNI's prerogative, and this appeared to be Mr. Sullivan's greatest problem with the paper. When coordination of overseas intelligence activities was explained to the ONNI representatives, they agreed that this type of coordination was not the proper function of the ONNI. The wording of the final two sentences was thus changed to insert interdepartmental ahead of the word "body," to strike worldwide from narcotics intelligence effort and add instead the word abroad, and to strike at the Washington level. The final two sentences thus read as follows: "A great need for an objective interdepartmental body which could monitor the narcotics intelligence effort abroad and ensure its adequate coordination is thus apparent. Such a body should be independent of parochial departmental and agency interests and be able to bring to bear on the problem all of the intelligence interests of the Government." With these changes ONNI

concluded, with, however, the addition of their footnote which appears on revised page 36. The same footnote also appears on page 39 where ONNI had the same problem with respect to Conclusion T. To be consistent with the change in paragraph 4 on page 36, the word Washington was deleted from the title of paragraph H on page 35 which had been "Washington Coordination."

d. On page 39, the final sentence of Conclusion S, which had been written to protect ONNI as well as to protect the DCI/CIA responsibilities for coordination of overseas activities, was deleted. This sentence read as follows: "While ONNI should over a period of time be able to fulfill this function with respect to domestic activities, it cannot and need not be expected to do so with respect to U. S. narcotics intelligence activities abroad."

e. In Conclusion T the word departmental was again inserted ahead of the word "body."

4. The CCPC also made some other changes in the paper which had nothing to do with ONNI's reservations. These were:


a. On page 29, the Treasury member of the USIB recommended that all except the first and last sentences of Paragraph VII, A. be deleted; the USIB on 14 December concurred with this recommendation. Without some other explanation, however, the two sentences standing alone did not make sense and did not lead into the remainder of the section. Some of the original language was thus restored by the CCPC, but the language to which the Treasury Department had originally objected concerning lack of agreement among Washington agencies as to their respective roles was omitted. In the revised page as circulated, however, there is an important typographical error: a comma should be placed after the word though in the third sentence, third line. The language of this paragraph is now agreed to by all members.

b. On page 40, Recommendation B. (3) had called for country team reports to be forwarded to the Intelligence Subcommittee of the CCINC Working Group. This wording was changed to read through normal channels on the premise that the country teams could not report directly to a committee.

- 4 -

5. With the changes as made by the CCPC, there should be no further problems with the paper. The only unresolved issue is the footnote on page 42 concerning a USIB committee.

25X1A



CIA Member  
Critical Collection Problems Committee